The Junction City Planning Commission met on Wednesday, November 20, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City Oregon.

Present were: Planning Commissioners, Alicia Beymer (Chair), James Hukill, Ken Wells, and Jeff Haag (Vice-Chair); Planning Alternate, Jack Sumner; Planner Jordan Cogburn; City Attorney, Carolyn Connelly and; Planning Secretary, Tere Andrews.

Absent: Planning Commissioner Beverly Ficek

1. OPEN MEETING AND REVIEW AGENDA

Chair Beymer opened the meeting at 6:30 pm and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

None.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT (FOR ITEMS NOT ALREADY ON THE AGENDA)

Dorris McCutchen, 740 W 17th Avenue, Junction City Oregon 97448, expressed concern about the naming of West 17th Place. She felt the name would be confusing to drivers looking for West 17th Avenue.

Planner Cogburn responded per Junction City Municipal Code, streets that ran east and west were numbered streets.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

• October 16, 2019

Motion: Commissioner Hukill made a motion to approve the October 16, 2019, minutes as written. Commissioner Haag seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed by a vote of 5:0:0. Chair Beymer, Commissioners, Hukill, Wells, Haag, and Sumner voted in favor.

5. PUBLIC HEARING: PLAN DESIGNATION & ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS (CPA-19-01/RZ-19-01)

Chair Beymer opened the public hearing for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezone of school district property, File #CPA-19-01/RZ-19-01 at 6:37 p.m.

Chair Beymer explained the steps of the public hearing. Planner Cogburn would present the staff report, followed by the applicant, then public testimony. The applicant would have an opportunity to respond to public testimony.

She asked if any Commissioner had a conflict of interest or ex-parte contact.

Chair Beymer declared an ex-parte contact in that she spoke with her neighbor about the property. Her neighbor was on the School Board. She declared her ability to make an unbiased decision.

Commissioners Sumner, and Haag declared they had both driven passed the property.

Chair Beymer asked if there were any challenges. There were none. She then asked Planner Cogburn to present the staff report.

Planner Cogburn reviewed the subject site was a 1.44-acre vacant parcel located on Rose Street owned by the Junction City School District. It was at times used as informal overflow parking. No development plans currently exist for the site.

Relevant policies associated with the request were, the City Municipal Code chapter 17.145 (Amendments); the Junction City Comprehensive Plan chapters one and three and; Statewide Planning Goals 1-3, 5, 6-13.

One written comment was received during the last comment period. The comment was from Lydia Schneider who wrote in opposition to the proposal. Planner Cogburn read the letter into the record. He then responded to comments contained in the Schneider letter. In response to comments about future use of the subject site he stated, the application was for amendments to the Plan Designation and Zoning maps only. It was his understanding the School District had no plans for future use of the subject site. Staff recommended the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council.

Commissioner Haag commented that none of the letters received were in favor of the proposal.

Commissioner Sumner asked if the proposal would affect the walkway and bridge located to the south on School District property.

Planner Cogburn responded the recent property line adjustment kept the walkway and bridge outside of the subject site. He added there were wetland areas to the east of the subject site that would remain unimpacted.

Commissioner Sumner asked for confirmation that there would be an easement over the existing sewer line on the subject site.

Public Works Director, Gary Kaping was in the audience and concurred.

There were no other questions from the Commission.

APPLICANT AND OTHERS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSAL

Chair Beymer invited testimony in favor of the application.

The applicant's representative, Teresa Bishow, 375 W 4th Avenue, Eugene, OR 97401 stated, also present were Kathleen Rodden-Nord, School District Superintendent, Bill Kloos, Land Use Attorney, and Scott Gibson, School Board member.

Ms. Bishow touched on the Statewide Planning Goals: Parks and Recreation, Housing, Public Facilities, and Natural Resources. The subject site was identified by the School District as 'surplus.'

- The subject site did not contain Statewide Goal 5 Resources, except the wetland area along the canal/drainageway. There were no proposed changes to the Wetland Overlay Resource District.
- The subject site was not identified as needed for a city park. The proposed Plan Amendment would not impact the ballfields or the gravel parking area.
- The proposal added 1.44 acres to the Junction City inventory of Medium Density Residential land. The School District proposed Medium Density Residential (MDR) because the Junction City Comprehensive Plan Land Inventory identified a deficit of MDR lands.

The School District provided an updated Long-Term Facilities Plan. Through the update process, the boundary of what was considered surplus property was confirmed. It was consistent with what was presented to the Planning Commission.

The Facilities Plan included improvement of the gravel parking areas associated with the Laurel Ballfields. The subject site was not in use by the school district and the proximal location to Laurel Elementary School was not conducive to placement of a modular classroom. If on-site expansion were needed, it would be located nearer the elementary school.

The Junction City Comprehensive Plan policies encouraged cost-effective infrastructure to support housing; and encouraged compatible integration of different land uses. The applicant felt the proposal met that policy.

The bike path would be retained, development of the subject site, no matter who developed it, required curbs, gutters and sidewalks along Rose Street.

Ms. Bishow thanked the Commission for their time.

Scott Gibson, 95644 Howard Lane, Junction City OR 97448, School Board Member offered to answer questions from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Hukill asked what was planned for the money made from sale of the subject site.

Mr. Gibson responded it would go toward payment for the vacant site at W 18th Avenue and Rose Street.

Commissioner Hukill asked why not sell a portion of that property.

Mr. Gibson responded for future planning purposes it was better to keep that property whole.

NEUTRAL PARTIES TO PROPOSAL

There was none.

OPPONENTS OF PROPOSAL

Dorris McCutcheon, 740 W 17th Avenue, Junction City Oregon 97448 offered photos of the subject site in use as overflow parking. Copies were retained for the record.

Ms. McCutcheon stated her concern, that there would be a piece-meal approach to the development of the subject site. She asked what the long-range plan was for the subject site.

Alice Neuberger, 1250 Oak Street, Junction City OR 97448 was concerned that if the subject site was re-designated and rezoned, that the same could happen with the ballfields. She asked for assurance that would not happen.

Planner Cogburn explained that there was a specific tax lot number associated with the subject site. The application was specific to the subject site.

Vanessa Brown, 905 W 17th Avenue, Junction City OR 97448, stated she worked for the schools. She was concerned about the open spaces available for children

in town. In the winter, the creek on the subject site flooded. There was wildlife in the area as well. She encouraged the Commission to consider the livability of the town.

Eric Dye, 1245 Quince Drive. Junction City OR 97448 did not feel the proposal was consistent with the character of the neighborhood.

Michael Schneider, 1280 Rose Street, Junction City, Oregon, 97448 expressed concerns about the existing traffic in the neighborhood. He also noted that the subject site was across the street from the Middle School. He added the wetlands on the site were a missed educational opportunity.

Richard Locke 1181 Quince Drive, Junction City, Oregon, 97448 expressed his concern about traffic in the area. He asked if the subject site had been identified as a location for this type of development. He strongly opposed the application.

Ben Buchanan, 1171 Quince Drive, Junction City, Oregon, 97448 felt it was a slippery slope and was in strong opposition.

CITY STAFF SUMMARY/RESPONSE TO PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Planner Cogburn responded to comments about development of the subject site. Rose Street was identified as a Major Collector. He reiterated that no development was proposed. If the subject site were to be zoned R2, apartments would be a Conditional Use and therefore a development proposal would come before the Planning Commission. Compatibility would be a determining factor in the Conditional Use process.

There was a mapping error included with original notice mailed in June. That was clarified during the last meeting. The application before the Commission was very specific to the tax lot listed in the staff report.

There was an identified deficit of medium density residential land per the Junction City Comprehensive Plan. There was a deficit in park land as well. However, he was unaware of any movement from the City Council or plans to include the subject site as a potential park site. Any potential development of the subject site would be required to show compliance with the State standards for the wetlands, as well as local standards. Any on-site stormwater retention would be required to meet current city standards.

APPLICANT'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Gibson responded to comments heard, the school board discussed potential zoning of R1 or R2. The recommendation was R2. However, the Board was not opposed to a zoning of R1. He encouraged review of the updated School District long range Facilities Plan. The parking from the bridge to the church was planned as structured parking with separate entrance and exit. It was a heavily used 'mudhole' with Trailers and RV parked there during tournaments. It was at the top of the list in the facilities plan.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Commissioner Sumner asked what the process would be to change the proposal to R1 zoning.

Planner Cogburn responded, there were a couple of ways to go about that. One option was to continue the hearing for additional information, or the Planning Commission could make a recommendation to Council for R1 zoning.

Kathleen Rodden Nord, School District superintendent, stated the district would not object if the Planning Commission recommended approval of amending the plan and zoning to a low density residential versus the requested medium density residential.

Ms. Bishow added at the City Council there would be a new public hearing. At that public hearing, the Council would be able to get additional public testimony on the Planning Commission recommendation.

Attorney Connelly clarified the public hearing remained open. If the Commission so chose, they could ask for testimony related to low density residential plan designation and corresponding R1 zoning.

Chair Beymer asked the Commission if there was a consensus to ask for testimony.

The Commission consensus was to hear from those who wished to testify about a potential low-density residential designation.

Eric Dye, 1245 Quince Drive. Junction City OR 97448 spoke in support of R1 zoning.

Kathleen Rodden-Nord, Junction City School District Superintendent, 325 Maple Street, Junction City Oregon 97448, stated the Board was receptive to R1 zoning. The request for R2 zoning was in response to the identified deficit of medium density residential but they certainly wanted to be responsive to the concerns of the community. Their intent was to be good stewards of the resources of the community. Proceeds from the sale of the subject site would go to pay down debt on school owned property that would ultimately be developed as an elementary school at some point in the future. The interest of the school board was to get the school district in a good financial position to have land available to build without having to incur further debt or ask our community to support purchase of land through a bond.

Commissioner Haag asked about the value of the subject site.

Ms. Rodden-Nord responded that no appraisal of the site had been done.

Michael Schneider, 1280 Rose Street, Junction City Oregon 97448, would not oppose R1 zoning.

Ben Buchanan, 1171 Quince Drive, Junction City, Oregon, 97448, agreed with previous comments.

Vanessa Brown 905 W 17th Avenue was neutral on the idea of R1. She was still concerned about a 'chipping away' of the ballfields.

Chair Beymer asked if there was anyone who wished to testify in opposition.

There were none.

Planner Cogburn said additional analysis would be needed as there was not a deficit of R1 land in the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Beymer asked if the applicant wished to comment.

The applicant did not.

Chair Beymer asked if there were any further questions from the Planning Commission.

There were none.

Chair Beymer then asked Attorney Connelly for procedural direction.

Attorney Connelly responded that the Commission had a recommended Final Order to the Council for R2. She suggested that, once the public hearing was closed, and assuming the Commission wanted to provide direction to the Council, that the Commission would approve the Final Order, subject to modifications by Staff to change the R2 zoning to R1.

Planner Cogburn added that would also include the re-designation from Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential.

Chair Beymer closed the record and public hearing at 7:53 pm.

Deliberations

Commissions Hukill and Haag commented the change to R1 seemed to address community concerns.

Commissioner Wells thanked the school district for providing a long-term facilities plan.

Commissioner Sumner supported the school district plan to pay down debt and enhance the neighborhood.

MOTION: Commissioner Sumner made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend Council approve of the School District application, File # CPA-19-01/RZ-19-01, with designated Low Density Residential with R1, not R2, zoning with supporting findings as provided by staff. Commissioner Hukill seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed by a vote of 5:0:0. Chair Beymer, Commissioners, Hukill, Wells, Haag, and Sumner voted in favor.

6. SESSION BREAK

Chair Beymer called for a break at 8:03 pm.

7. SESSION CALLED TO ORDER

Chair Beymer the meeting to order at 8:08 pm

8. OFFICER ELECTIONS

Secretary Andrews reported at the October Planning Commission meeting, the Commission tabled Officer elections to the November meeting. There were currently two regular seat vacancies, and one alternate vacancy. No applications had been received.

A discussion took place about the filling of vacancies and the related term expirations. The Commission considered an amendment to the Planning Commission By-Laws to permit a vacancy to be filled for a full four-year term rather than the remainder of the vacant term. The Commission felt it might encourage citizens to apply if they knew it would be a four-year term rather than the remainder of an unexpired term. Planning Commission By-Laws permitted the Commission to amend their By-Laws provided a one-month notice was given.

Consensus of the Commission was to give that notice at the November 20, 2019 meeting in order to consider an amendment at the December 18, 2019 meeting.

9. PLANNING ACTIVITY REPORT

The Commission reviewed the Planning Activity Report.

10. COMMISSION AGENDA FORECASTER

The Commission reviewed the agenda forecaster.

11. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

None.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Commissioner Hukill made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Sumner seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed by a vote of 5:0:0. Chair Beymer, Commissioners, Hukill, Wells, Haag, and Sumner voted in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 8:24 p.m.

The next standing Planning Commission meeting was scheduled for Wednesday December 18, 2019 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,	
Tere Andrews, Planning Commission Secret	 ary
	Alicia Beymer, Planning Commission Chair